



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

Grammatik der neuhochdeutschen Sprache von August Engelen,
5. Auflage herausgegeben unter Mitwirkung von Hermann
Jantzen. Berlin, 1902, Wilhelm Schulze's Verlag (L. Grieben
Jun.). viii, 619 pp.

Deutsche Sprachlehre für höhere Lehranstalten von Dr. Ludwig
Sütterlin und Dr. Albert Waag. R. Voigtländers Verlag in
Leipzig, 1905. 186 pp.

Deutsche Sprachlehre für Mittelschulen von J. W. Nagl. Wien,
1906, Carl Fromme, 248 pp.

Within the last ten years a large number of German Grammars of different grades and of different character have found their way to the reviewer's table. To judge by the number there must be a considerable interest in the subject of grammar in the German-speaking territory of Europe, and to judge by the warm and often insistent tone there must be a wide and deep-seated interest in the unfolding and development of the present literary language. One would naturally think that the common object of these grammarians would be to facilitate a *uniform* development of speech, and yet a careful reading of these books creates the impression that these men have often actually effected the very opposite result, *i. e.*, have added to the confusion already existing. Not only do the representatives of the different sections, such as North Germany, Austria, Switzerland, etc., vary in a large number of points in their rules and recommendations, but those who live in the same city or province set up different ideals of speech. Thus men who should be working harmoniously together are often doing their best to spread views widely diverging. A student of this literature would feel inclined to lose faith in the efficacy of grammars and grammatical instruction in the school, if he did not observe here and there indications of

their potency for good, namely where they all agree. A few examples are given here to illustrate the beneficent influence of the grammar. Practically all these books unite in combating the formation of the plural by adding *s*. The foreigner finds nothing in German more confusing than the plural of nouns, and he often feels inclined to say petulantly that the stupid Germans do not even know how to speak their own language. There is something to justify this feeling, when little by little one collects in his reading seven different plurals for the same word. He is not always able to console himself with the thought that there is a faint possibility that these forms may some day become differentiated and that thus the language will become enriched. The German grammarians of our time are almost a unit in urging the unmutated *e*-plural and the result of this teaching is apparent. Goethe's and Schiller's prose very often contrasts unfavorably with the German of to-day as found even in a newspaper with respect to the inflection of nouns and indicates clearly that the feeling of dislike for the *s*-plural in choice language has become fairly established. This movement toward the unmutated *e*-plural corresponds in a faint measure to the triumph of the *s*-plural in English. A greater uniformity is needed in German, for the triumph of one plural type will not only bring greater simplicity in general, but will gradually remove the multiplicity of forms for one word, which now exists, as the German in the absence of a general plural type often does not really know how to form the plural of new and uncommon words. This trend toward the unmutated *e*-plural, not only noticeable in connection with foreign words but also with good German forms, should commend itself to all as a movement toward needed simplicity, even tho there is no probability that such a radical simplification as in English can ever be attained.

The grammarians also agree quite uniformly in their struggle to replace useless foreign words with those of German coinage. This movement is now deep-seated and, tho opposed by a few names that command respect, has taken possession of the great body of those who are interested in the growth and development of the mother-tongue. This tendency is now so strong that it is quite impossible to outline its future. It may do great things. The writer of this article is inclined to think that it can be pushed without serious danger to the language. The one great gain that outweighs all

the disadvantages is the wealth of imagery that it brings with it. Our own rich English language is often great in its directness and simple forcefulness, but there is often a clear lack of pictures which transform the abstract into living figures and convert the prosy concrete into scenes dramatic or poetic. Of course our English foreign words bring pictures to him who is versed in many languages, but to the people the imagery is largely lost and indeed a great loss it is.

Another movement, less strong than the struggle against foreign words is the movement for a uniform pronunciation. This question has not only been taken up by lesser lights, but also by Wilhelm Braune in his *Über die Einigung der deutschen Aussprache*, Halle, 1905, by Karl Luick in his *Deutsche Lautlehre*, Leipzig und Wien, 1904, by Wilhelm Viëtor in his *Elemente der Phonetik des Deutschen, Englischen und Französischen*, Leipzig, 5th ed. 1904, and by a number of others. These three works have been especially mentioned because the practical question of a uniform pronunciation that may be acceptable to many or to all has been considered of paramount importance. The standard of the stage as set forth in Siebs's *Deutsche Bühnenaussprache*, Berlin, 2nd ed. 1901, has hovered before all these writers as an ideal that at some future time may to a greater or less extent be realized. The time has not yet come to decide definitively upon a national pronunciation, but almost all agree in one general tendency, namely to conform the pronunciation more and more to the written language.

Altho the German grammarians are united upon a number of very important questions they are at variance upon such a large number of little points that little good can be expected from the present numerous publications intended for use in school, except so far as they transmit the accepted body of facts. It is a pity that this is as it is, for it might be possible to turn this extensive interest to a better account. The one great need to-day in grammatical studies is a more careful observation of the actual linguistic phenomena of our time and their prompt publication. The differences that now separate grammarians may disappear when they give up their theories and study the facts. In many cases, however, it will not be given to them to discover laws or even tendencies, but only to record the observation that the language has not yet assumed its definitive form. Even tho final forms cannot be stated the individual and local usage may in all such cases be formulated and this

information will surely be of interest and of value to many, but these formulations should be represented as individual and local and not as fixed laws to be followed by everybody. Even where there are differences of usage each with a wide following it is useless to decide either for the one or the other. This race like every other contest cannot be decided until the course is run. That many points must thus be left open for future decision is not a discouraging sign, but one of great hope indicating the countless active forces that are gradually developing in a great people for its future needs. The discordant element in all of these grammars will entirely disappear when their authors unite in presenting the fixed body of grammatical facts and elsewhere confine themselves to describing without prejudice the fluctuations of present usage, leaving hopefully the language to work out its own development in accordance with its own deep-seated laws which may now not be visible to us, but which will some day become apparent.

From among the large number of new Grammars or new editions of older works three are here selected for a short review.

Engelien-Jantzen's *Grammatik der neuhochdeutschen Sprache* does not seem to be as widely known in our country as it deserves. It is somewhat similar in scope to Heyse-Lyon's *Deutsche Grammatik* which has found such favor among American teachers of German, but it differs from it markedly in one respect, namely in the large body of quotations from leading German authors from Luther to the present day which it gives to illustrate present and past usage. The range of authors is much less wide than that found in the larger work of Blatz, but the selection is a good one and the examples are often so copiously given that the book is one that teachers of German will generally appreciate. This work is characterized by a careful observation of not only the literary usage but also that of popular speech. A number of interesting and valuable remarks are made upon North German pronunciation and syntax. On page 478 the author calls attention to the peculiar N. G. use of the future indicative with the force of a past tense and cites the following example: Und wie er so ungebührlich gegen mich ausfällt, da werd ich ihn ins andere Zimmer nehmen und werd ihn fragen, woher er das weiß (instead of da nahm ich ihn ins andere Zimmer und fragte ihn). The present reviewer has found a large number

of such examples in Fritz Reuter's works. Also an example in Wildenbruch's *Das edle Blut*: Dann greift er den Kleinen am Halse, und nun werden die beiden anfangen, sich mitten in der Stunde regelrecht zu hauen. Engeliën regards these forms as real future formations and refers to a similar use of this tense in Greek. Professor Karsten, the editor of the *Journal*, once suggested in a private conversation that this peculiar form may be in fact a real historical present, a survival of the old inchoative present form still found elsewhere in dialect as a present tense, as in: So oft die Red' auf'n Gelbhofbauer kommt, *wird* bei ihm's Radel *laufend* und da haspelt er die ganze alte Geschicht' aber (Auzengruber's *Kreuzelschreiber*, 1, 1). Altho this formation may be felt by Wildenbruch as a future, for he would not use a pure dialectic present in his beautiful story, Professor Karsten's view seems to offer the true historical explanation of this peculiar construction.

The *Sprachlehre* by Sütterlin and Waag is too small to be able to present the body of grammatical facts fully, but it is so suggestive and so full of higher linguistic truth that it will find many friends among those who are not only interested in facts, but also in their historical explanation or their phonetic or psychological development. The book is indeed a little gem. Its authors have contributed two other useful books to recent grammatical literature: *Die deutsche Sprache der Gegenwart* von Ludwig Sütterlin, R. Voigtländers Verlag, 1900, 381 pp. and *Bedeutungsentwicklung unseres Wortschatzes* von Albert Waag, Lahr i. B., Druck und Verlag von Moritz Schauenburg, 1901, 200 pp.

Nagl's book fairly bristles with happy suggestions, but it is written in such a narrow, dogmatic tone that the reader often feels himself aroused to opposition. On page 103 starting from the former adjective nature of the second component of *solch* (so + lich) the author states that it cannot like the demonstrative *dieser* or *jener* influence the form of the following qualifying adjective, but must as an adjective be inflected the same as the following qualifying adjective, and then says: "(immer Eigenschaftswort): mit solcher guter Kost, solche edle Taten." He further insists that *manch* must in the plural be treated like *solch* and adds that only half-educated newspaper men violate this rule. The two following expressions from two great

representative German scholars will show what a rash and untrustworthy grammarian Mr. Nagl is : solche lautlichen Elemente (Brugmann's *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, p. 285), trotz mancher unvermeidlichen Mängel (Wilmanns's *Deutsche Grammatik*, Vol. I, p. viii). These two examples have been selected from a formidable list which the reviewer has collected from the recent publications of prominent German scholars and literary men. Mr. Nagl has missed the point entirely. Such words as *solch*, *sämtlich*, *manch*, etc. are struggling toward the estate of pronominals like *dieser* and hence often require the weak form of the adjective after them. On the other hand the older nature of qualifying adjective is also, especially in the plural, still felt and hence the strong adjective often follows. The different words are not all in the same stage of development. Thus *all* and *kein* have passed almost completely over into the state of pronominals, *solch* and *sämtlich* have not advanced quite so far, and *einig*, *manch*, *viel*, and *wenig* are still further behind. Our grammarians should state the facts in such cases and not be so free with their theories, and should especially avoid such positive statements that this or that is *always* found in choice language. The word "always" is a very strong word. The indiscriminate attacks upon the newspapers might also justly be omitted. The reviewer has collected and examined the specific charges of a number of these grammarians against the newspaper. He stands ready to show that every one of these so-called grammatical errors occurs fully as frequently in the language of prominent German scholars. These so-called errors, as illustrated above, are not real mistakes but new tendencies that are rooted, not in careless speech, but in the feeling of the German people. In some cases they may be unfortunate, in most cases they are legitimate developments in the direction of simplicity or finer shades of meaning. These tendencies ought to be studied with interest and not be condemned. Almost all the sciences are studying phenomena, only in Grammars do we still find the old-fashioned love of theory deeply entrenched fighting its hopeless battles.

On page 126 Mr. Nagl sets up a new theory for the use of *haben* and *sein* in compound tenses : Durch das Hilfszeitwort *sein* wird im ganzen das Unabsichtliche, Zuständliche, Unwillkürliche, durch *haben* das Absichtliche, Bewufste, Selbstbewufste ausgedrückt. We give here a few of his examples : Ich *habe* geschlafen,—weil ich

selbst den ordnungsmässigen Wechsel zwischen Wachen und erquickendem Schlafe *will*; ich *bin* eingeschlafen, der Moment des Einschlafens kann von mir nicht gewählt werden. According to this rule of Mr. Nagl's we ought to say: Ich bin (not *haben*) gelitten, for we surely do not desire to suffer. The old rule that *haben* is used with intransitives to denote durative action and *sein* to indicate the beginning or end of an action is still the best rule that we have. Hermann Paul has treated this subject from this point of view at considerable length in a recent publication. The only place where Mr. Nagl's rule seems to hold better than the old one is in such examples as: ich habe angefangen, aufgehört, etc. Even here his explanation does not bear close study, for quite evidently the real cause for the use of *haben* here is that the force of the simple verbs *fangen*, *hören*, etc., asserts itself. A newer development here is the use of *sein* in accordance with the general rule: Ich bin von oben angefangen, von der hohen Uhl her, hoch von oben, und bin gesunken (Frenssen's *Jörn Uhl*, chap. xxvi). Wie ich schon sagte, ist man erst in den letzten Jahren angefangen, von dem Kloster das zu retten und zu erhalten, was noch zu erretten und zu erhalten ist (O. E. Kiesel in *Hamburger Nachrichten*, 13 Feb. 1905).

GEORGE O. CURME.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

English Grammar for Beginners, by J. P. Kinard. The Macmillan Company, 1906. 249 pages.

The fault that high school teachers frequently find with many of the English grammars for use in the lower grades is that such books are either too difficult or too simple. On the one hand, written by university graduates, the definitions are sometimes put in language too difficult for the learner to grasp, so that the study of grammar often resolves itself into a process of memorizing unintelligible definitions and tedious lists of rules and exceptions. On the other hand, in the effort to bring the subject well within the level of the student's development and training, some grammarians have succeeded only in making their books puerile and unattractive.

Dr. Kinard has skilfully avoided these two extremes, and has pro-